REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for participating in the telephone interview on October 27, 2010. The following remarks encompass Applicant's interview summary.

Claims 1, 4-10, 12-14, 16-28, 35-37, 40-46, 48-50, 52-64, 71-72, and 93-94 are pending in the application upon entry of this amendment. As further explained below, the claim amendments are based on the features discussed during the telephone interview as being distinctive over the cited references, particularly Dauerer. New claims 93-94 have been added, and various claims also have been amended to provide proper dependencies, or canceled in view of the other claim amendments.

Favorable reconsideration is requested in view of the claim amendments and following remarks.

I. OVERVIEW OF THE CLAIM AMENDMENTS

During the telephone interview, the following three features of Applicant's system were discussed as being distinctive over the cited references. These features are described in application at least at paragraphs [0060-0061], [0065-0066], and [0076-0077], which describe various ways for defining and manipulating the workspace, and for selecting particular screens for navigation.

First, Applicant's system provides for the automatic expansion of the workspace dimensions by moving a sub-application window outside the current dimensions of the workspace. Such features previously had been recited in dependent claims 3 and 39, which have now been incorporated into respective independent claims 1 and 37. More specifically, in accordance with such features independent computer-readable medium claim 1 has been amended to recite:

> computer code that logically associates a plurality of sub-application windows with respective logical screens within the logical main application workspace, the sub-application windows for displaying content of at least one open sub-application, and that automatically increases the number of logical screens in response to a user action to move one of the sub-application windows to a new location outside current dimensions of the continuous logical main application workspace.

A comparable amendment has been made to independent method claim 37.

Second, in Applicant's system a navigation box is provided that represents in miniature form the entire logical application workspace. The navigation box is employed to move the physically viewable work area from one screen to another screen by a selection from the navigation box, and the navigation box is displayed ***simultaneously with one of the logical screens***. The navigation box had been introduced in computer-readable medium claim 18, which has been amended to independent form. In addition, in accordance with the above features, claim 18 also has been amended to recite:

> computer code that moves the physically viewable work area in the logical main application workspace from an area displaying a currently displayed one of the logical screens to an area displaying a logical screen selected by a user action from the navigation box;
>
> wherein the navigation box is displayed simultaneously in the physically viewable work area with one of the logical screens.

Comparable amendments have been made to method claim 54.

Third, as a more specific usage of the navigation box, a sub-application window may be moved from one screen to another screen without changing the display of the currently displayed logical screen. One manner of performing such a manipulation is to represent a sub-application window as an iconic representation in the navigation box, and to move the iconic representation of the sub-application window from one screen representation in the navigation box to another screen representation in the navigation box. This may be performed without altering the logical screen being viewed in the physically viewable work area. These various features of the navigation box are recited in new independent claims 93 (computer-readable medium) and 94 (method). Dependent computer-readable medium claims 20-23, and comparable method claims 56-59, also recite such features so as recite such features further in combination with the simultaneity feature of claims 18 and 54.

As a result of these features, the claimed invention is suitable for manipulating large amounts of data across a variety of applications and associated sub-application windows. For example, a user may manipulate and access multiple sub-application windows from a browser, application programs, entertainment programs, etc. with ease across a virtual workspace far larger than any reasonably sized monitor. Via the navigation box, a user may move the viewable work area, and adjust the positioning of the sub-application windows within the workspace even without altering the current viewable area. This enhances the usefulness of the workspace as compared to conventional systems. As discussed during the interview, the references cited by the Examiner do not disclose or suggest the above features of the claimed invention, and therefore do not afford a user the advantages the claimed invention provides.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b)/103(a)

As in the previous Office Action, the claims principally stand rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Dauerer et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,841,435 (Dauerer). Certain dependent claims stand rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Dauerer in view of Anderson et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0189597 (Anderson). Dauerer is cited against the broader features of the claimed invention, including the independent claims, with Anderson being more tertiary. Accordingly, the rejections based on Dauerer are pertinent to the current claim amendments.

The system of Dauerer, the base reference for all rejections, provides a virtual workspace larger than a viewable area. As depicted in Fig. 3 of Dauerer, the virtual workspace can be a multiple of a physical display 54 arranged in an "array", such as the 3 x 3 array depicted in Fig. 3. (Dauerer at col. 4, lines 38-43.) The generation of a workspace based on multiples of a physical display bears some similarity to aspects of the claimed screens, and the Examiner indeed equates the two. The nature of the purported screens of Dauerer, however, differs substantially from the nature of the claimed logical screens as recited in the amended claims.

A. The Claimed Expansion of the Workspace

As stated above, independent claims 1 and 37 have been amended to recite the automatic expansion of the workspace dimensions by moving a sub-application window outside the current dimensions of the workspace. By virtue of these features, Applicant's system employs the association between a sub-application window and a respective screen to provide a mechanism for expanding the size of the workspace by moving a sub-application window outside the current workspace dimensions. The purported screens of Dauerer lack such features.

In the current Office Action, the Examiner cites passages of Dauerer that purportedly relate to the placement or movement of application windows within the application workspace beyond the physical display area. (See, e.g., Dauerer at col. 2, lines 23-26 and 51-60; col. 4, lines 33-35 and 63-67; col. 6, lines 20-29.) None of these passages discloses or suggests automatically expanding the size of the workspace by moving a sub-application window.

As to the expansion of the workspace, in the Office Action the Examiner particularly relies on Dauerer at col. 4, lines 63-67 as disclosing such features. This passage describes an "anchored object" which moves with the viewable area (physical display 54) as the viewable area is moved within the workspace. Dauerer goes on to state: "The anchored object 58 ***cannot be moved outside the physical display*** 54." (Dauerer at col. 4, line 66 to col. 5, line 1, emphasis added.) It follows, therefore, that an anchored object simply cannot be moved outside the current dimensions of the continuous logical main application workspace as claimed. In the Office Action, the Examiner also cites to Dauerer at col. 5, lines 35-40 as disclosing the claimed workspace expansion. This passage describes how the workspace dimensions may be adjusted by employing a pointing device, such as a mouse pointer, to drag one of the edges or a corner of the workspace. (See Dauerer Fig. 3, elements 52, 52a, and 66.) The mouse pointer, however, cannot move a sub-application window to expand the workspace dimensions.

During the interview, these deficiencies of Daurer were clarified. In particular, in contrast to the claimed invention, the operation of Dauerer described above does not expand the workspace by ***dragging (or otherwise moving) a sub-application window outside the current workspace dimensions***. Accordingly, Dauerer does not disclose or suggest such features as recited in independent claims 1 and 37, and thus does not anticipate such claims.

B. Simultaneous Display of the Claimed Navigation Box

As stated above, claims 18 and 54 (rewritten to independent form) have been amended to recite a navigation box that is employed to move the physically viewable work area from one screen to another screen by a user selection from the navigation box, and the navigation box is displayed ***simultaneously with one of the logical screens***. As discussed during the interview, the system of Dauerer does not disclose or suggest such features.

Regarding the claimed navigation box, in the Office Action the Examiner relies on Dauerer at col. 6, lines 20-29 as disclosing such features. The Examiner appears to have equated the "reduced virtual display 52" to the claimed navigation box. The reduced virtual display 52 actually is described in more detail in Dauerer at col. 5, lines 47-62, as depicted in Fig. 6.

The reduced virtual display 52 of Dauerer differs from the navigation box as recited in independent claims 18 and 54. The reduced virtual display 52 of Dauerer does not contain an indication of each logical screen as claimed. For example, Dauerer Fig. 6 lacks a grid of the purported screens as contained in Dauerer Fig. 3. In contrast, the navigation box 84 of Applicant's system contains an indication of each logical screen S1-S9. (See, e.g., Application Fig. 7.) As a result, a user of Applicant's system can navigate the workspace by selecting a particular screen from within the navigation box, clicking on the selection, and jumping to that screen within the logical main application workspace.

As discussed specifically during the interview, even if the reduced virtual display 52 of Dauerer can be considered a navigation box in a broad sense, the reduced virtual

display 52 coincides with the viewable area. In contrast to the claimed invention, therefore, the reduced virtual display 52 is not displayed simultaneously with one of the logical screens. For the above reasons, Dauerer does anticipate independent claims 18 and 54 reciting the navigation box.

C. Movement of Sub-application Windows With the Navigation Box

Additionally, as also discussed during the interview, in Applicant's system sub-applications within the main application workspace can be moved to another logical screen by clicking on the iconic representation of the sub-application in the navigator box, and dragging the icon to any user chosen logical screen as also represented in the navigator box. This operation may be performed utilizing the navigation box without altering which logical screen is being viewed within the physically viewable work area. Dauerer does not disclose or suggest any comparable features. Accordingly, Dauerer does not anticipate new independent claims 93-94, and dependent claims 20-23 and 56-59, for at least these additional reasons.

D. Anderson Does Not Disclose the Deficiencies of Dauerer

Anderson does not disclose or suggest the above deficiencies of Dauerer. As explained in response to previous Office Actions, Anderson does not disclose any features comparable to the claimed screens. Anderson discloses a system that only arranges content within the physically viewable area defined by a physical computer system display. One skilled in the art, therefore, would not combine Anderson with a system such as Dauerer for navigating a workspace larger than the viewable area.

In this vein, most claims stand rejected based on Dauerer as an anticipating reference, with Anderson being cited as to features of certain dependent claims. Anderson discloses displaying multiple desktops on a single display. Each desktop may be displayed as a scaled pane having dimensions proportional to, but less than, the dimensions of a non-scaled desktop. Alternatively, one desktop may be maximized to substantially the entire physical display, with the remaining desktops being tiled in the status bar. The user may switch among the desktops to make a selected desktop active from either the paned view or from the status bar. (See, e.g., paragraphs [0008],

[0034], [0037], figures 5-8.) The desktops do not form a contiguous logical workspace and instead are each logically isolated from one another. The system of Anderson, therefore, would not be applied by one skilled in the art to navigate a workspace beyond a physical display area as described in Dauerer.

Accordingly, insofar as the claimed screens concept is lacking in Anderson, the claimed invention is patentable over the combination of Dauerer and Anderson for at least the above reasons.

III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, claims 1, 4-10, 12-14, 16-28, 35-37, 40-46, 48-50, 52-64, 71-72, and 93-94 are allowable, and the application is in condition for allowance. A prompt action to such end is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone interview would be helpful to facilitate favorable prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Should a petition for an extension of time be necessary for the timely reply to the outstanding Office Action (or if such a petition has been made and an additional extension is necessary), petition is hereby made and the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees (including additional claim fees) to Deposit Account No. 18-0988, Reference No. CUTCP0103US.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

By /Lawrence S. Drasner/
Lawrence S. Drasner; Reg. No. 38,127

1621 Euclid Avenue
Nineteenth Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
Telephone: (216) 621-1113
Facsimile: (216) 621-6165